

Serial No. 10/040,770

Page 7 of 10

**Remarks**

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. In the Office Action dated October 6, 2005, Claims 1-19 stand pending in the application. Claim 13 has been cancelled. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner for a reconsideration of the rejections.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 13-17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse. Applicants have removed the terms arbitrary and rarely from the claims. These amendments are considered of equal scope and therefore do not narrow the claims.

Claim 19 has also been amended to reflect that the content filtering server is configured to block restricted content based on the filter's privilege, the request, and the new port number. Applicants believe that this amendment overcomes this rejection.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-6, 11-15, and 17-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Freund (U.S. Pat. 2003/0055962). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 is directed to a method of content filtering including receiving a request for content from a client computer, where said request includes a port number assigned to an application program running on the client computer, determining that the port number is a predetermined port number associated with the request for content, renumbering the request with a new port number, transmitting said request with said new port number to a content filtering server that is configured to listen to the request on the new port number and obtaining from said content filtering server an indication of whether the content is restricted based on the request and the new port number.

The Examiner points to paragraph 147, step 910 for the proposition of receiving a request for content from a client computer, where said request includes a port number assigned to an application program running on the client computer. Applicants have

Serial No. 10/040,770

Page 8 of 10

reviewed paragraph 147 and specifically step 910 and can find no teaching or suggestion for this proposition. Step 910 recites "a connection attempt from one of the local computers to the internet as received by the router." Applicants therefore respectfully submit that this step is not found in the *Freund* reference.

For the step of "determining that the port number is a predetermined port number associated with a request for content," the Examiner cites paragraph 147, step 950. Applicants believe that the Examiner meant to refer to paragraph 148 in which the step 950 is described. Applicants admit that a port number set forth in step 910 and admits that a rerouting manager is set forth. However, other portions of the claim are significantly different.

The Examiner points to paragraph 149 for transmitting the request with the new port number to a content filtering server configured to listen for request on the new port number. The Examiner specifically points to the phrase "reroutes this packet to the sandbox server". Applicants respectfully submit that the sandbox server is not a content filtering server. Sandbox server is described as a server that is used to categorize a reason for noncompliance. The paragraph also describes the sandbox server as not running required security software. There is not teaching or suggestion that the sandbox server is a content filtering server.

The Examiner also points to paragraph 149 and the phrase "using this information . . ." for the proposition of obtaining from the content filtering server an indication of whether the content is restricted based on the request and the new port number. Applicants respectfully submits that it is useful to review the entire sentence which states, "Using this information, the sandbox server then displays a page with information enabling the client to address the specific problem that was detected." Applicants respectfully submit that the sandbox server is described on page 11, paragraphs 114 through 117. Specifically, in paragraph 117, a number of ports and the content of communications with respect to the port are set forth. There is no teaching or suggestion for content filtering and whether or not a particular request is restricted based upon a request and a new port number. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of Claim 1.

Serial No. 10/040,770

Page 9 of 10

Claims 2-6 and 11-14 depend from Claim 1 and are also believed to be allowable for the same reasons as set forth above.

Independent Claim 14 contains similar limitations to Claim 1, in that, the apparatus contains filtering procedures that include instructions similar to those set forth in Claim 1. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of Claim 14.

Claims 15 and 17 depend from Claim 14 and are also believed to be allowable for the same reason as set forth above. Claim 18 is a computer program and Claim 19 is a system that also contains similar limitations to content filtering as set forth in Claim 1. Applicants respectfully request that independent Claims 18 and 19 are also allowable for the same reasons as set forth above.

#### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 7-10 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freund in view of "SonicWall Soho Internet Security Appliance" (SonicWall). Applicants respectfully traverse.

As mentioned above, the Freund reference has several deficiencies including the lack of a content filter. Applicants have reviewed pages 99 through 101 and can find no teaching or suggestion for content filtering in these passages. Applicants admit that a bypass filter is set forth on page 100. However, Applicants respectfully submit that a bypass filter is not the same as a content filter. Therefore, Applicants also respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider this rejection as well since the deficiencies of Freund have not been found in this SonicWall reference.

Serial No. 10/040,770

Page 10 of 10

**Conclusion**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (310) 964-4615.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Georgann S. Grunebach, Reg. No. 33,179  
Assistant General Counsel, DIRECTV

Dated: June 7, 2006

The DIRECTV Group, Inc.  
RE / R08 / A109  
2230 East Imperial Highway  
P.O. Box 956  
El Segundo, CA 90245-0956

Telephone: (310) 964-4615